

### **REMARKS**

At the outset, Applicants wish to thank Examiner A. Beck for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representatives during the telephonic interview at the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office on October 21, 2010. The substance of the interview is incorporated in the following remarks.

#### **Summary of the Office Action**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-5, 7-12 and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the alleged Applicant's Admitted Prior Art ("AAPA") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,936,608 to Springer ("Springer"), U.S. Patent No. 6,778,160 to Kubota et al. ("Kubota"), U.S. Patent No. 6,697,250 to Kuo ("Kuo") and U.S. Patent No. 6,222,512 to Tajima et al. ("Tajima").

#### **Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Applicant has amended claims 1, 7, and 9. Claims 2, 5-6, 13, and 15-17 were previously canceled. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-4, 7-12 and 14 are presently pending. No new matter has been added. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

#### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103**

Claims 1-5, 7-12 and 14-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the alleged Applicant's Admitted Prior Art ("AAPA") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,936,608

to Springer ("Springer"), U.S. Patent No. 6,778,160 to Kubota et al. ("Kubota"), U.S. Patent No. 6,697,250 to Kuo ("Kuo") and U.S. Patent No. 6,222,512 to Tajima et al. ("Tajima"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections for at least the following reasons.

As amended, independent claims 1, 7, and 9 recite, inter alia, wherein the liquid crystal display is driven at a high speed and, at the same time, in a high picture quality mode, the video signal is applied to the liquid crystal panel at the specific area and the non-specific area in the first field of one frame. None of the applied references teach or suggest at least these features, described at paragraph [0044] of the publication of the instant application, as discussed during the telephonic interview conducted on October 21, 2010.

Each and every claimed feature must be taught or suggested by the prior art to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention. Because cited art, whether taken alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest each feature of independent claims 1, 7, and 9, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn. Furthermore, claims 3-4, 8, 10-12 and 14 depend from one of independent claims 1, 7, and 9. Accordingly, claims 3-4, 8, 10-12 are also allowable because of the additional features they recite and the reasons stated above.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing Amendment Accompanied by RCE, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of all pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested, and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Dated: October 26, 2010

By:

Robert J. Goodell  
Reg. No. 41,040

**Customer No.: 009629**

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

Telephone: 202-739-3000

Facsimile: 202-739-3001